

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division**

ePLUS INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-620 (REP)
)	
v.)	
)	
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

JUDGMENT

Certain issues in this action were tried before a jury with Senior United States District Judge Robert E. Payne presiding, and the jury has rendered its verdict (Docket No. 600). In accordance with the verdict of the jury and the rulings of the Court on non-jury issues, and pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, judgment is hereby entered as to all issues of infringement liability and validity in this action, and it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that:

1. Defendant Lawson Software, Inc. ("Lawson") has failed to prove that any claim of U.S. Patent Numbers 6,505,172 ("172 Patent"), 6,023,683 ("683 Patent") or 6,055,516 ("516 Patent") is invalid.
2. Judgment is entered in favor of Plaintiff ePlus, Inc. ("ePlus") and against Lawson for infringement of the patents in suit as follows:
 - (a) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation ("LSF")/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order

Modules) and Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” infringes claim 1 of the ’172 Patent, either directly or indirectly;

(b) Lawson’s Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation (“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules), and Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” and Punchout infringes claims 3, 26, 28, and 29 of the ’683 Patent and claim 1 of the ’172 Patent, either directly or indirectly;

(c) Lawson’s Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation (“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules), Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” Punchout, and Electronic Data Interchange or “EDI,” infringes claims 3, 26, 28, and 29 of the ’683 Patent and claim 1 of the ’172 Patent, either directly or indirectly;

(d) By operation of the Parties’ Stipulation With Respect To M3 Infringement, as set forth in the Revised Amended Final Pretrial Order (Dkt. No. 481) at Section II, Lawson’s M3 e-Procurement Software infringes claims 3, 26, 28, and 29 of the ’683 Patent and claim 1 of the ’172 Patent, either directly or indirectly.

3. Judgment is entered in favor of Lawson and against ePlus as follows:

(a) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation (“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) does not infringe claims 1 or 6 of the ’516 Patent;

(b) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation (“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) and Requisition Self-Service or “RSS” does not infringe claims 3 or 28 of the ’683 Patent, or claims 1, 6, 9, 21, 22 or 29 of the ’516 Patent;

(c) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation (“LSF”)/Process

Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) and Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” and Punchout does not infringe claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 21, 22 or 29 of the ’516 Patent;

(d) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation(“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) and Electronic Data Interchange or “EDI” does not infringe claim 26 of the ’683 patent or claims 1 or 6 of the ’516 patent;

(e) The Lawson Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation(“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules), Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” Punchout, and Electronic Data Interchange or “EDI” does not infringe claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 21, 22 or 29 of the ’516 Patent;

(f) By operation of the Parties’ Stipulation With Respect To M3 Infringement, as set forth in the Revised Amended Final Pretrial Order (Docket no. 481) at Section II, Lawson’s M3 e-procurement Software does not infringe claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 21, 22 or 29 of the ’516 Patent.

It is SO ORDERED

United States District Judge

Dated: _____